

**REMARKS**

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the present application. The final Office Action dated October 15, 2004 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

By this Response, claims 1, 2 and 10 have been amended, and claim 3 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-2, 4-7 and 9-20 are pending in the application with claims 4, 7, 9 and 16-20 being withdrawn from consideration. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection in view of the above amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants have amended claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 5, 6 and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,341,003, issued to Ashizawa et al. (hereafter "Ashizawa"). Applicants submit "a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." (*Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because Ashizawa fails to teach or suggest each and every element recited in the claims of the present application. For example, Ashizawa fails to teach or suggest an in-plane switching mode LCD device including all the structural elements recited in independent claim 1. Specifically, Ashizawa fails to teach or suggest "the first and second data electrodes each have a substantially rectangular edge portion and a rounded portion" as recited in independent claim 1 of the present application. Because Ashizawa fails to teach or suggest at least this element of independent claim 1, claim 1 and its dependent claims 2, 5 and 6 are allowable over Ashizawa.

Ashizawa also fails to teach an in-plane switching liquid crystal display device including, among other features, "a traverse data electrode overlying the common line and connecting second ends of the data electrodes, the traverse data electrode having a first portion having a first width and a second portion having a second width, wherein the first width is less than the second

width” as recited in independent claim 10 of the present application. Applicants respectfully note on page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner appears to equate the capacitor portion Cstg to the traverse data electrode element recited in independent claim 10. As illustrated in FIG. 16 of Ashizawa, the capacitor portion Cstg “is composed of an counter voltage signal line CL and the pixel electrode PX (a dielectric film (insulating film) PS1 formed between the counter voltage signal line CL and the pixel electrode is not shown in FIG. 16). A liquid crystal existing between the pixel electrode P and the counter electrode CT is driven by the signal held by the storage capacitor portion Cstg” (col. 22, lines 3-10). Based upon this description in Ashizawa, it becomes apparent that the capacitor portion Cstg is not a structural element that is equivalent to the traverse data electrode recited in independent claim 10. Because Ashizawa fails to teach or suggest each of the elements recited in independent claim 10, claim 10 and its dependent claims 11 and 12.

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 5, 6 and 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,281,958, issued to Nakajima (hereafter “Nakajima”) in view of Applicant’s Related Art (hereafter “Related Art”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because neither Nakajima nor the Related Art, analyzed alone or in any combination, teaches or suggests the combined features recited in the claims of the present application. For example, Nakajima and the Related Art fail to teach or suggest an in-plane switching mode LCD device including, among other features, “the first and second data electrodes each have a substantially rectangular edge portion and a rounded edge portion” as recited in independent claim 1 of the present application.

The Office Action concedes that Nakajima fails to teach (1) “the data electrodes 40 located away from the common line 32 (as shown in Fig. 3) are rounded; and (2) “in a single embodiment the combination that the first and second data electrodes are connected both at the one side of the first data electrode near the transistor and also over the common line”. To compensate for these deficiencies, the Office Action relies upon the Related Art. Applicants respectfully submit the Related Art fails to remedy the deficient teachings of Nakajima.

Specifically, the Related Art does not teach “the first and second data electrodes each have a substantially rectangular edge portion and a rounded edge portion” as recited in independent claim 1 of the present application. Because the Related Art does not teach at least

this feature of independent claim 1, the Related Art does not remedy the deficient teachings of Nakajima. Further, no combination of the Related Art and Nakajima would provide an in-plane switching mode LCD device having all the combined features recited in independent claim 1. Accordingly, independent claim 1 and its dependent claims 2, 5 and 6 are allowable over any combination of Nakajima and the Related Art.

Independent claim 10 is allowable over any combination of Nakajima and the Related Art because neither Nakajima nor the Related Art teaches or suggests the combined features recited in claim 10. In particular, Nakajima and the Related Art fail to teach or suggest an in-plane switching liquid crystal display device that includes, among other features, "a traverse data electrode overlying the common line and connecting second ends of the data electrodes, the traverse data electrode having a first portion having a first width and a second portion having a second width, wherein the first width is less than the second width" as recited in independent claim 10 of the present application. Applicants respectfully submit this structural relationship is not taught or suggested neither in Nakajima nor the Related Art. Further, there is no teaching in the Related Art which would provide proper motivation to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of Nakajima to obtain a device having the combined features recited in independent claim 10.

Because Nakajima and the Related Art fail to teach or suggest the combined features recited in independent claim 10, claim 10 and its dependent claims 11-15 are allowable over any combination of Nakajima and the Related Art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding objection and rejections of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If the Examiner deems that a telephone conversation would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (202) 496-7500.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the

Application No.: 09/892,476  
Amendment dated January 14, 2005  
Reply to Office Action dated October 15, 2004

Docket No.: 8733.481.00-US

filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: January 14, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie Hayes  
Valerie Hayes

Registration No.: 53,005  
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-7500  
Attorneys for Applicant